

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office action mailed 27 July 2005. Reexamination and reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Specifically, the Examiner stated that the drawings must show every feature of invention specified in the claims, and stated that the limitation of a "first side facing a display" must be shown or cancelled from the claims. Accordingly, applicants have cancelled claim 9, and thus submit that the limitations at issue have been removed. Applicants thus respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Objections to the Claims

Claim 15 was objected to because of the term "lest". Accordingly, applicants have amended claim 15 to recite "least". A similar amendment has been made to claim 31. Applicants thus respectfully request that the objection to the claims be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 11-14, 23-30 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,719,465 to Breeijen, hereinafter Breeijen. Likewise, claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13 and 15-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Design Patent No. D413,398 to Foo, hereinafter Foo. Likewise, claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-14 and 15-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Design Patent No. D488,874 to Li, hereinafter Li. Finally, claims 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 11, 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,253,151 to Mephram et al, hereinafter Mephram.

In the above amendments, applicants have cancelled claims 1-14 and 38, and amended independent claims 15, 23 and 31, and amended dependent claims 16, 17, 18,

Appl. No10/781,098

Reply to Office Action of July 27, 2005

19, 18, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33, 34, 35 and 37 and cancelled dependent claims 20, 21, 27, 36 and 38. Applicants submit that the amended independent claims are patentably distinct over the cited references.

With regard to amended independent claim 15, in the office action the Examiner rejected claim 15 as being anticipated by both Foo and Li. Applicants submit that amended independent claim 15 is patentably distinct over both the cited references. Specifically, amended independent claim 15 clarifies that the fluorescent lamp includes first and a second plurality of legs arranged in a first and a second plane, and wherein "the first plurality of legs is interdigitated with the second plurality of legs to create a continuous lamp surface along a first side of the fluorescent lamp". Applicants submit that neither of the cited references discloses such a lamp structure.

Specifically, while Foo discloses a lamp with legs in a first and second plane, the legs are not interdigitated "to create a continuous lamp surface on the first side of the fluorescent lamp". For example, compare the side view of lamp 100 illustrated in applicants' FIG. 2 with the corresponding side view in FIG. 1 of Foo. Applicants' FIG. 2 shows an example embodiment of a lamp where the legs are interdigitated to create a continuous lamp surface. In contrast, there is no side view in Foo that shows a continuous lamp surface formed from interdigitated legs.

With regard to Li, applicants submit that Li fails to show a first plurality of legs where at least three successive legs in the first plurality of legs reside in a first plane and a second plurality of legs where at least three successive legs in the second plurality of legs reside in a second plane different from said first plane, and wherein the first and second planes are parallel.

Thus, applicants submit that amended independent claim 15 is patentably distinct over the cited references. Furthermore, as dependent claims 16, 17, 18, 19 and 22 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 15, they are also submitted to be patentably distinct.

Appl. No10/781,098

Reply to Office Action of July 27, 2005

With regard to amended independent claim 23, in the office action the Examiner rejected claim 23 as being anticipated by Foo, Li and Breeijen. Applicants submit that amended independent claim 23 is patentably distinct over each of the cited references. Specifically, amended independent claim 23 clarifies that the fluorescent lamp includes plurality legs arranged in a first plane and a second plane, where successive legs alternate between the first plane and the second plane, and wherein "the first plane is substantially parallel to the second plane, and wherein the first and second plurality of legs are spaced to provide a continuous lamp surface along a first side of the fluorescent lamp, and wherein the first side is substantially parallel with the first plane". Applicants submit that none of the cited references discloses such a lamp structure.

Specifically, while Foo discloses a lamp with legs in a first and second plane, the legs do not alternate between planes and are not spaced "to create a continuous lamp surface on the first side of the fluorescent lamp". For example, compare the side view of lamp 300 illustrated in applicants' FIG. 7 and the side view of lamp 400 illustrated in applicants' FIG. 11 with the corresponding side view in FIG. 1 of Foo. Again, applicants' figures show examples of lamps where the legs are spaced to create a continuous lamp surface. In contrast, there is no side view Foo that shows a continuous lamp surface formed from the plurality of legs.

With regard to Li, applicants submit that Li fails to likewise show a first plurality of legs in a first plane, a second plurality of legs in a second plane, where successive legs alternate between planes and "wherein the first plane is substantially parallel to the second plane, and wherein the first and second plurality of legs are spaced to provide a continuous lamp surface on a first side of the fluorescent lamp, where the first side is substantially parallel with the first plane".

Appl. No10/781,098

Reply to Office Action of July 27, 2005

Similiary, with regard to Breeijen, applicants submit that Breeijen also fails to disclosure a lamp with legs and curves as recited and “wherein the first plane is substantially parallel to the second plane, and wherein the first and second plurality of legs are spaced to provide a continuous lamp surface on a first side of the fluorescent lamp, and wherein the first side is substantially parallel with the first plane”.

Thus, applicants submit that amended independent claim 23 is patentably distinct over the cited references. Furthermore, as dependent claims 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 23, they are also submitted to be patentably distinct.

With regard to amended independent claim 31, in the office action the Examiner rejected claim 31 as being anticipated by both Foo and Li. Applicants submit that amended independent claim 31 is patentably distinct over both the cited references. Specifically, amended independent claim 31 clarifies that the fluorescent lamp includes first and second plurality of legs arranged in a first and a second curve, and wherein “the first plurality of legs is interdigitated with the second plurality of legs to create a continuous lamp surface along a first side of the fluorescent lamp”. Applicants submit that neither of the cited references discloses such a lamp structure.

Specifically, as discussed above, Foo fails to disclose legs are interdigitated “to create a continuous lamp surface on the first side of the fluorescent lamp”. Again, compare the side view of lamp 500 illustrated in applicants’ FIG. 15 with the corresponding side view in FIG. 1 of Foo. Applicants’ FIG. 15 shows an example embodiment of a lamp where the legs are interdigitated to create a continuous lamp surface. In contrast, there is no side view in Foo that shows a continuous lamp surface formed from interdigitated legs. Second Foo fails teach a first plurality of legs in a first curve and a second plurality of legs in a second curve

Appl. No10/781,098

Reply to Office Action of July 27, 2005

Additionally, both Foo and Li fail to show a first plurality of legs where at least three successive legs in the first plurality of legs reside in a first curve and a second plurality of legs where at least three successive legs in the second plurality of legs reside in a second curve different from said first curve, where the first and second curves are parallel.

Thus, applicants submit that amended independent claim 31 is patentably distinct over the cited references. Furthermore, as dependent claims 32, 33, 34, 35 and 37 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 31, they are also submitted to be patentably distinct.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to the independent claims and because each recite features which are patentable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

Hence, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Appl. No10/781,098

Reply to Office Action of July 27, 2005

If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: 27 Oct 2005

By: SJ-ARM
S. Jared Pitts
Reg. No. 38,579
(480) 385-5060